

## Council Report - 29<sup>th</sup> October 2022

Since the last Council meeting a considerable amount of the groups time has been devoted to responding to a number of enquiries regarding clarification around such issues as:

- Discontinued time for both PJs and FJPs - there is still considerable confusion over this

Within the Rules & Procedure of the Judge Appointment Scheme;

- What is the procedure to follow in cases of reinstated candidates
- Advising a "sleeping" BAC in its journey to revival
- around with whom the responsibility lies to request it should an application for an extension to a PJs time be required.

Within the Accelerated Judges Scheme:

- clarification around the use of the words "mentor" and "preferred" when considering the role of full judges within the AJ scheme
- processes to be applied should either a candidate or BAC have issues that may result in a situation in which an appeal may be forthcoming.

also

- Consulting with the Judges Guild to ensure its paperwork and processes are up to date with regards to their role in the training of stewards at level 1

We have now undertaken the three planned GGC trials - This proved to be a very useful exercise with a lot of very interesting aspects being raised. Overall, everyone was very supportive of this approach and all showed a very open and willing determination to make it work.

There were a number of concerns raised:

- that the new scheme ensured that BACs were not excluded from the process - this was a major concern of all BACs involved in the trails
- The ability to appoint independent chairs and secretaries for GGC's:

Ideally, the majority view was for these officers to be totally independent of any BAC contained within the GGC but it was acknowledged that this could be difficult. The suggestion that the BACs chairs should undertake the role on a rotational basis was discussed and felt to be viable especially within GGC's that only contain 2/3 breeds but not within GGC's with 4 or more breeds. Overall, however, it was felt not to be ideal solution.

- Logistics around arranging meetings - opinions varied - the smaller GGC BACs were, in the main, happy to, do both the BAC and GGC meetings on the same day however, the larger GGC's with 4 or more breeds were more in favour of BAC meetings held at a different time but within a very specified and limited timeframe so that the advice taken to the GGC's was current.
- All meetings should be electronic but concerns over the platforms that could/should be used and finance for any licences that may be required etc.
- General funding issues at all levels were also a concern.
- Stewards -
- although there was unanimous approval for the training elements within the current scheme there was a strong feeling that level two was still too "long-winded". There was a majority agreement of feeling that the number of stewarding certificates still required at this stage were excessive. It was considered that any steward that has reached this point is already experienced at handling all breeds therefore it was felt that 5 was sufficient at this level and that the emphasis should be on the training aspects (i.e. report writing) as these are the most relevant aspects to concentrate when undertaking an advanced stewarding engagement.
- It was suggested that stewarding for BIS and Supreme should be accredited within level one. This was well received by the majority.
- Renaming the stewards: completion of level 1 = GGCF Steward, completion of level 2 = GCCF Accredited Steward which it was felt acknowledged the extra training undertaken also found favour.

- It was felt by one *GGC* that all stewards training should be under the aegis of the Judges Guild however the others felt that level 2 should stay within the *BAC/GGC* brief.
- Overall, all were happy to work within the new framework for the governance of *BAC/GGCs* prior to the new training regime being introduced as it was felt that any issues with governance would be "ironed" out before they need to deal with demands of understanding and implementing any new system of judge training.

One *BAC* representative raised concerns over the viability of their breeds *BAC* considering there was currently no active breeders within *GCCF* and therefore, to all intents and purposes no functioning *BAC*. He was advised that, if this was a true assessment of the situation, the *BAC* could consider Associate Membership of the *GGC* until the situation changed.

However, this highlighted a concern around how a breed would be catered for should a *BAC* cease to function??

After making some adjustments due to suggestions arising from the *GGC* trials, the subgroup presented the first draft of the revised document for the governance and administration of both *BACs* and *GGCs* to the full *JASRG* committee for comment and approval. A few small changes were agreed and after considerable discussion around two areas of concern - finance and complaints - it was agreed that these were areas in which consultation with the Board/*FC* and *IC* were needed. However, it was felt that the draft, although these elements still need to be resolved, was ready to go to the Board for comment. The intention was that, prior to presenting the final draft to Council for approval, the current draft could be submitted to this meeting for comment however the Board felt that it required more time to fully digest the document and comment prior to making it available for comment from the wider *GCCF* audience.

As you are all aware, the Judge appointment scheme document is divided into two primary sections;

## Firstly - The Philosophy and Principles or The System

This deals with the formation and governance of a BAC and it is this element that the document I have just been talking about.

The second section deals with the actual Rules and Procedures for the selection (training) of judges and it is this element of the Judges Appointment document that the sub group has now started to work on. This part of the JAS actually outlines how a judge is trained and the expectations on both parties (BAC and Judge) throughout the training process.

We are considering such approaches as parallel/shadow judging/breed and or breed comparison presentations/open book online testing to list but a few.

It is within this area of the JAS documentation that deals with all elements of training and expectations for judges albeit a Pupil/Full/specialist/retired/emeritus or from another organisation. The role and/or training of single breed specialist judges will also be included within this document. However, there is one major issue around such judges - their viability to Show Mangers especially under our current show format but I'm sure it's not insurmountable.

### Accelerated Judges Scheme:

The AJ scheme is working well but it must be remembered that, although it comes under the governance of a BAC, it stands alone from the Rules of Procedure for the Selection of Judges

However, it is acknowledged that the current rules are not best schematized or composed for clarity of intent in some areas so we are looking to update these, especially around those areas that have generated the most queries.

Further to the work I have already commented on:

The Board had requested at their last meeting we discuss the validity for and/or updating procedures in relation to the Judges Panel. It was agreed that the current process is flawed and, one of the JAS members, (who is a member of IC and works closely with K Jarvis) has volunteered to look at this and bring forward suggestions for discussion at our next meeting.

As always, we are more than happy to receive any suggestions towards improvement and change to make the training for judges both appealing and constructive so as to build on our current numbers so as to secure the future of GCCF.

The next meeting of the full JASRG is scheduled for late November.